Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Worksheet

U.S. Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE:: Red Rock/Sloan FO LLNVS02000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-S010-2010-0019-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: N-82425-01

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Renewal of Short-Term Right-of-Way (STROW)

<u>LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:</u> The proposed project is located in the Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area. The legal description is as follows:

Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada

T. 21 S., R. 59 E.,

Sec. 4, S½NW¼SE¼, N½SW¼SE¼, S½SW¼;

Sec. 5, SE1/4SE1/4;

Sec. 8, NE¼NE¼, W½SE¼NE¼, E½SW¼NE¼, NE¼SE¼, E½NW¼SE¼;

Sec. 9, W½SW¼;

Sec. 16, N½NW¼NW¼.

APPLICANT (if any): NV Energy

A. Description of Proposed Action and any application mitigation measures

The proposed action is to renew a short-term right-of-way (STROW) for 8.18 acres (11,880 ft. in length and varying from 10–20 ft. in width) issued to NV Energy for a temporary construction area needed for the installation of a power distribution line to the Red Rock Fire Station and campground. The current STROW will expire December 31, 2009, a 3 year extension has been requested.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

RMP Name

NV - Red Rock Date Approved: May 20, 2005

Canyon NCA RMP

RMP Name

Las Vegas Resource Date Approved: October 5, 1998

Management Plan

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Las Vegas Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision Objectives RW-1 and RW-1-h in that it "meets public demand and reduces impacts to sensitive resources by providing an orderly system of development for transportation, including legal access to private in holdings, communications, flood control, major utility transmission lines, and related facilities".

The proposed action is in conformance with the RMP for Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area (RRNCA) signed in May, 2005, meeting the plan's objectives of protecting natural resources and improving visitor services.

The proposed action conforms to the land use plan terms and conditions as required by 43 CFR 1610.5-3 under the authority of the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA).

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action

Las Vegas RMP EIS, ROD signed October 5, 1998.

Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area EIS, ROD signed May 20, 2005

Environmental Assessment, FONSI and Decision Record, #NV-2005-0451, signed September 8, 2006.

Biological Opinion, File No. 1-5-04-F-526.APD6 for Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

The proposed project N-82425-01 is a renewal request by NV Energy to extend the expiration date to December 31, 2012 to allow for the temporary work areas required for the installation of power distribution line to the Red Rock Canyon Fire Station which has not been altered in design displayed by EA-050-2005-0451, signed on September 8, 2006.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, give current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes, the Environmental Assessment contained a proposed action and a no-action. There have been no new environmental concerns, interests or resource values that were not addressed in the Environmental Assessment that was completed for the project.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

It is reasonable to conclude that there would be no substantial change to the analysis of the proposed action.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Since this request is for a renewal of the STROW to allow additional time to complete construction of the authorized facilities, there would be no new cumulative effects associated with this action.

Are there public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

The proposed action involves a renewal to allow additional time to complete construction of the authorized facilities. The public involvement and review for the Environmental Assessment was adequate for the current proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Note

Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Fred S. Edwards	Botanist	Botany, T&E Species/BLM
Katie Kleinick	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, T&E Species/BLM
Amelia Savage	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, T&E Species/BLM
Mark Boatwright	Archeologist	Archeology, Native Amer. Consultationt/BLM
Nora Caplette	Weeds Coordinator	Noxious & Invasive Weeds/BLM
Janet Cheek	Realty Specialist	Lands/Realty/BLM
Kirstin Cannon	Public Affairs Specialist	Public Affairs/BLM
Robert Taylor	Special Projects Manager	Fire Station Project Manager/BLM
John Baribault	ADM Support Services	Fire Station Project Manager/BLM
Kevin Oliver	ADM Fire/Fire Management Officer	Fire/BLM
Lee Kirk	Outdoor Recreation Planner, Red Rock NCA	Recreation/BLM

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

Signature of Project Lead

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Signature of the Responsible Official

Note:

The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute and appealable decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.